

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
JAMES ROBINSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

THE CITY OF NEW YORK, et al.,

Defendants.
-----X

ROBERT PARRIS,

Plaintiff,

-v-

THE CITY OF NEW YORK, et al.,

Defendants.
-----X

JEFFREY DAVIDSON,

Plaintiff,

-v-

CORRECTION OFFICER MASIEY, et al.,

Defendants.
-----X

VINCENT McALLISTER,

Plaintiff,

-v-

THE CITY OF NEW YORK, et al.,

Defendants.
-----X

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 3/21/08

ORDER

05 Civ. 8826 (GEL) (MHD)

05 Civ. 8830 (GEL) (MHD)

05 Civ. 8833 (GEL) (MHD)

06 Civ. 1805 (GEL) (MHD)

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| -----X | : | |
| KEITH McFADDEN, | : | |
| | : | |
| <u>Plaintiff,</u> | : | |
| | : | 06 Civ. 1828 (GEL) (MHD) |
| -v- | : | |
| | : | |
| THE CITY OF NEW YORK, <u>et al.</u> , | : | |
| | : | |
| <u>Defendants.</u> | : | |
| -----X | : | |
| HARRY WILSON, | : | |
| | : | |
| <u>Plaintiff,</u> | : | |
| | : | 06 Civ. 7777 (GEL) (MHD) |
| -v- | : | |
| | : | |
| THE CITY OF NEW YORK, <u>et al.</u> , | : | |
| | : | |
| <u>Defendants.</u> | : | |
| -----X | : | |

GERARD E. LYNCH, District Judge:

The Court has carefully reviewed the thorough and well-reasoned Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Michael H. Dolinger, dated March 5, 2008, and has received no substantive objections to the R&R from any party.¹ Jeffrey Davidson, however, the plaintiff in No. 05 Civ. 8833, has timely requested an extension of time until March 25, 2008, to respond to the R&R as it pertains to his case.


¹ The Court received a submission, dated March 17, 2008, from Keith McFadden, the plaintiff in No. 06 Civ. 1828. Although McFadden “objects” to portions of the R&R, he does not object to Judge Dolinger’s ultimate recommendation that the defendants’ motion to dismiss his complaint be denied in its entirety. Instead, McFadden directs his objections to portions of the R&R that discuss the defendants’ arguments, in effect expressing his disagreement with the defendants’ legal argument and factual assertions. The R&R merely describes, and does not adopt the defendants’ factual assertions. The accuracy of the parties’ allegations will not be decided until the parties have had the opportunity to take discovery and present evidence.

' Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. With respect to Nos. 05 Civ. 8826, 05 Civ. 8830, 06 Civ. 1805, 06 Civ. 1828, and 06 Civ. 7777, the R&R is hereby adopted as the opinion of the Court, and the defendants' motions to dismiss the complaints are denied. The Clerk is respectfully directed to mark the motions to dismiss in those case closed.
2. With respect to No. 05 Civ. 8833, the time for plaintiff Jeffrey Davidson to object or otherwise respond to the R&R is extended to March 25, 2008.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: New York, New York
March 21, 2008



GERARD E. LYNCH
United States District Judge